DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 834 JC 860 126

AUTHOR Koltai, Leslie
TITLE State of the District Address, 1985-86.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Community Coll. District, Calif.
PUB DATE 5 Mar 86
NOTE 16p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; Community Colleges; *Declining Enrollment; Faculty Development; *Financial Problems; Multicampus Districts; *Organizational Change; Program Development; *Reduction in Force; *Retrenchment; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

An overview is provided of the problems facing the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), the current situation and immediate program of action, and the District's objectives for the short- and long-term future. The first section addresses the nature and scope of the problems brought about in the LACCD and California community colleges by declining enrollments and reduced funding. Pointing to underfunding as the central problem faced by the LACCD, this section explains that 70% of California's community college districts need special funding to stabilize their operations and reviews the findings of investigations of the LACCD by outside agencies. The next sections consider changes that took place in the LACCD in 1985-86, including: (1) a 10% reduction in force of district administration; (2) a reorganization of policy and operations; (3) the implementation of several new programs integrating the programs of LACCD colleges with K-12 and other segments of higher education; and (4) a decentralization of operational responsibilities. In the next section, plans for restructuring the faculty and staff of the LACCD are reviewed. After stating the objectives of the LACCD Board of Trustees and looking at plans for program expansion, the report concludes with comments on the future of the LACCD. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. KOLTAI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED266834

1985-86 STATE OF THE DISTRICT ADDRESS

Delivered by
Chancellor Leslie Koltai
Los Angeles Community College District

March 5, 1986

JC 860 126

The Chancellor's State of the District address has traditionally been delivered in the early Fall. The occasion served to mark the beginning of a new teaching year, to set the educational priorities of the institution as a whole, and to introduce new ideas into the planning process.

In recent years, early Fall has been a time of uncertainty and crisis. As our enrollments have declined, our funding has declined, and our last three Fall semesters have been plagued with emergency budget reductions and consequent disruptions of what *should* have been times of fresh commitment and enthusiasm. Throughout each of those difficult Fall crises, we learned to look with growing anticipation toward the next state budget, hoping for relief from the pressures of underfunding and the rigors of the downward spiral. The January-to-March period has become the new point at which we can begin to plan and speak with some assurance about the coming year.

I would suggest that the change of date of the State of the District address from the beginning of the *academic* year to the beginning of the *budget* cycle is highly symbolic. It points up the central problem which community colleges have faced in the 1980's, and that is the deep tension between mission and finance. Our purpose is to educate every one over eighteen and able to profit from education, and yet our financial resources are not just insufficient to meet that mission, but so reduced as to threaten the survival of some of California's community colleges. When institutions are forced to shift their time and attention away from their primary activity to questions of basic survival, as many college districts in California have been forced to do, they must make extraordinary efforts to remember their mission and purpose and to hold to their educational principles.

I believe that we in the Los Angeles Community College District have tried to do that. It is my sincere belief that the current crisis in California Community Colleges will soon be resolved and that we will once again be able to concentrate more fully on our mission of educating students, and that we will return to the rhythms and cycles of our educational programs.

In this address, I would like to accomplish three things: first, to describe the nature of the problems we have confronted in the past year and the actions taken to deal with them; second, to outline the current situation and our immediate program of action; and third, to present objectives for the short and long term future. And throughout the discussion, I intend to share with you my confidence in the future health and vitality of the District.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

Let me begin with a broad overview of the problems we have been facing. First, it should be noted that we are not at all unique either in the State or in the nation. Across the country, community colleges are facing declining enrollments, reduced public funding, and increased competition from four-year schools, all of which is a precise reflection of our own situation. The explosive growth of community colleges and the expansion of their mission and services which took place in the 1960's and 1970's have come to a halt everywhere. In our desire to bring the benefits of education to the many previously unserved constituencies in American society, community colleges have come to be seen by certain critics as being part of the social welfare structure, rather than as part of the higher education establishment. Our critics say that we are trying to be all things to all people. So when social expenditures fell into disfavor with the voting public, community colleges found themselves being reexamined as to their mission and cost effectiveness.

Almost every community college system in the country has been, or is now under, scrutiny by its political and educational leadership. Special commissions have been established in Maryland and Virginia, as in California, for the purpose of charting the future of community colleges in the environment of declining enrollment, higher tuition, and an eroding financial base. Whereas the public demand from community colleges in the 1960s and 1970s was for access, and our success was measured in numbers of new students enrolled, today the public demand is for results – more transfers, more job training, and more rigor in weeding out the unsuccessful.

At the state level our funding changes have been more erratic than the national norm, perhaps, but they have moved in the same downward direction. Because of the accelerating features of the ADA funding mechanism, urban districts were hardest hit by the imposition of tuition, and suffered the sharpest enrollment and revenue drops. However, the system as a whole has been underfunded since 1978. Fully 49 out of 70 of the State's college districts had declining enrollments last year and were therefore eligible for stabilization funds this year; 39 districts had expenditures greater than revenues; 38 had less than a 5% contingency reserve, and 8 had no reserves.

I believe that the Governor himself has recognized the threat posed to the community college system by continued underfunding and has found it necessary to support the system with stabilization

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

funding for another year. When 70% of California's college districts need special funding to stabilize their operations, the financial health of the whole system can be said to be in serious danger.

Let me be quite clear that the central problem faced by this District, and the system as a whole, is underfunding. There are other problems, to be sure, but funding is basic and cannot be overlooked. Between Fall 1981 and Fall 1985 in the Los Angeles Community College District, weekly student contact hours fell 31%. Measured in constant dollars, the LACCD has lost 38% of its spending power since 1977-78. These figures are at the heart of the issue. We have suffered a significant decline in enrollment and funding, and at the same time, we are in the midst of a momentous shift in our mission.

The combination of negative factors, that is chronic underfunding and unclear mission, would be a severe enough challenge for an institution in itself. Unfortunately, the specific condition of the LACCD is closely examined by the expertise of a larger public. Because of the size of our district, everything that we do is big, and everything is noticed and subject to commentary. We are not alone in having problems; we are simply in the vanguard.

Intervention by outside agencies has affected the system as a whole and the LACCD in particular. In August 1985, the Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy (Little Hoover Commission) initiated a study of California's Community College System focusing on the adequacy of financial accountability. The five-month study, which included two public hearings and extensive research, primarily dealt with case studies of the four districts which requested an advance on apportionments – Chaffey, Lassen, Peralta, and Los Angeles.

During the Commission review, many allegations of mismanagement regarding our district were submitted or presented in testimony during the public hearings. As a result, the Commission dedicated a higher level of analysis towards reviewing specific areas raised, and dedicated a separate chapter in summarizing their findings regarding allegations in our district in the recently released report entitled "Inadequate Financial Accountability in California's Community College System."

I am pleased that of the eleven specific areas analyzed, the Commission's investigation did not uncover a single instance of nonfeasance. In fact, seven of the areas were either dismissed outright or satisfactorily resolved upon review and evaluation of facts. The remaining four issues include the expense of delivering financial aid (a national issue), the failure of Community Services programs to be self-supporting (a statewide concern being address-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5

ed by the Master Plan Review Commission) and two minor campus issues in which charges against the district were not found to be true, but on which the Little Hoover had some suggestions to make.

The Little Hoover Commission's findings called for a change in community college governance which would create a Board of Governors strong enough to provide direction to local districts and to intervene in their management. They argued that elected trustees are not as accountable to taxpayers as they were prior to Proposition 13. They were also critical of colleges which did not maintain reserves. It is ironic that when college districts had adequate reserves just a few years ago, they were criticized for having them, and were even threatened with their loss. The lesson for local districts appears to be that investigative bodies are free of both history and responsibility, a luxury not available to trustees and administrators.

As you know, there are several other outside agencies examining district operations. Their studies are not yet complete, but will, I am sure, provide an objective outside point of view on the District's fiscal and management operations. I believe that their reports will be helpful; but I also am confident that they will find our operations to be sound. Moreover, I believe that the course we have been following for the past year has put us in a position to deal with the financial and educational challenges before us.

The Year of Change

In my State of the District Address on March 1st of last year, I stated that 1985-86 would be a year of organizational change. The changes I proposed were, first, to reduce the size of our operations sufficiently to live within our reduced ADA revenues, and second, to develop a concept I called the "New College" in order to respond to the changing environment of the 1980s and beyond.

Let me report to you our progress on these two initiatives. With regard to the first requirement of reducing the size of our operations, we began immediately in the Spring to reduce the size of the District Office headquarters. In my Status-Update message of May 15th, I announced a reduction in force of approximately 10% in district administration and a reorganization of policy and operational functions in the central office. The latter were accomplished in June, 1985.

The purpose of these two changes was not only to achieve cost savings to the District, but to increase efficiency, to separate service functions from policy making functions, and to place more responsibility for service functions with campus administrations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the past year, we have placed more district-wide activities in the hands of campus presidents. Responsibility for coordinating the production of college catalogs rests at Valley College, and for International Education at City College.

The development of the concept of the New College has also moved forward. As you will recall, the changes I proposed related to three areas in which society is changing. I suggested first, that our colleges would have to be more competitive. The decreased number of traditional college age students is forcing colleges into the marketplace to compete for enrollment, and that competition is based on quality and value. Second, the new college would have to pay closer attention to the work ethics of its students, faculty and staff. And finally, I noted the necessity of incorporating technology, particularly computers, into our classrooms, libraries, and offices.

1985-86 Program Development

The Los Angeles Community College District has made great progress in integrating the programs of our colleges with both K-12 and with the other segments of higher education. In the past year, I have personally visited with the superintendents of most of the school districts that fall within or are adjacent to our district to discuss ways in which we can cooperate.

The Educational Services Division has developed programs which will bring high school students onto our campuses for their classes, relieving overcrowding in the Los Angeles Unified District. Starting next week, 950 students from local high schools will be attending classes at City, East, Trade-Technical and Valley Colleges. It is our hope that many of them will find our campuses attractive, and continue their college educations there. The LACCD is also developing programs which will make us the major provider of in-service training needs of unified school teachers.

The LACCD is also concentrating on the development of relations with four-year universities. The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education has defined transfer education as a primary function of California Community Colleges and has called for a renewed emphasis in that area. We are prepared to meet the challenge. In the past year, the LACCD has again paid particular attention to the development of the transfer programs of its colleges.

Transfer Centers have been opened on six of our campuses to provide counseling and other assistance to students who wish to continue their studies at a four-year university. Information on the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 7

universities' application process, admissions requirements and financial aid opportunities is provided, and tours of prospective transfer schools are offered.

The purpose of the Transfer Centers is to make students aware of the transfer opportunities available to them. Whether newly enrolled or applying for graduation, students are being contacted and supplied with the information and assistance they need to successfully transfer.

Los Angeles City, East Los Angeles, Los Angeles Harbor, Los Angeles Pierce, Los Angeles Valley and West Los Angeles Colleges are among the 17 in the state that have received supplemental funding to maintain such centers.

The Ford Foundation has awarded grants totaling $175,000 to three colleges in our district to support innovative transfer related activities. Los Angeles Harbor College received $80,000 to develop and distribute a directory of outstanding students from underrepresented groups attending Harbor and 13 other colleges in the greater Los Angeles area. That directory will be distributed to four-year institutions to facilitate their recruitment of these fine students.

An $80,000 grant went to Los Angeles City College for a two-year project for a curriculum-based Honors Transfer Program, and West Los Angeles College received $15,000 to develop an internal data-gathering system by conducting a two-year study of declared transfer students.

All of our colleges are also involved in a pilot project with UCLA to help prepare potential transfer students for university-level work. The project consists of an intensive five-unit curriculum and text, which integrates reading, writing and thinking. It was developed by a group of 12 community college English teachers, in cooperation with UCLA's Office of Academic Interinstitutional Programs and the National Writing Project. It places emphasis on increasing fluency and comprehension. Los Angeles Mission, West Los Angeles and Los Angeles Trade-Technical College are involved in the project. The UCLA Alliance Program also continues to assist in the development of coordinated transfer programs on our college campuses. We are grateful to Dean Juan Lara and the OAIP for their continued cooperation and support of this important activity.

In the vocational area, indentified by the Master Plan Commission as the other primary mission of our colleges, the LACCD has made significant progress. We have seen a 200% increase in outside funding during the past year, in addition to programs with support from the Joint Training Partnership Act and the Employment Training Panel. A total of $1.3 million has been received so far this

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

fiscal year for specially-funded programs.

This increase is the result of funding from several new sources, as well as private corporations and foundations. It reflects a more aggressive cultivation of outside funding agencies as a means of opening new opportunities and increasing repeat funding. In addition, consolidation of development activities at the District Office has created a more complete and focused development program.

Our efforts to offer customized classroom activities for local business and industry have met with great success, and we anticipate a program of articulation of community college classes and those offered by local corporations. We are also developing the concept of a Downtown Center, offering courses to local businesses through classes offered at the District Office site.

Another of our successes has been the establishment of the Southwest Employment Referral and Vocational (or SERVE) Center at Los Angeles Southwest College. A $1 million allocation from the state, in cooperation with the Employment Development Department, provided the seed money for this program, which provides a one-stop center for training and employment services for up to 800 local youths. The center offers information, assessment, counseling, job training and placement, skills upgrading, small business employee development, and customized training for industry. Four hundred residents of south central Los Angeles are being placed in occupational activities such as college certificate programs, Job Training Partnership Act and Employment Training Panel projects or jobs. In addition, they will be receiving basic skills instruction in reading and math on an open-entry/open-exit basis.

Working with the Santa Monica Community College District we have resolved the issue of student flow through a contract between the two districts, without having to take the matter to the legislature. An agreement has been forged that allows students to enroll in either Santa Monica College or a Los Angeles Community College, regardless of their city of residence, with a reimbursement scale agreed upon between the two districts.

The Los Angeles Community College District will be receiving approximately $600,000 under the terms of the agreement, and those monies will be used to develop programs at West Los Angeles and Los Angeles Southwest College. For many years the LACCD paid a "seat tax" to Santa Monica for each of our students attending their college. Those funds helped build Santa Monica College, so it is appropriate that some of these funds are now flowing back to help rebuild several of our campuses.

We are currently involved in negotiations with Glendale College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to develop a similar agreement. Funds generated through that agreement, if any, will be earmarked for development of programs at Los Angeles City and Valley Colleges.

We have continued to develop Project ACCESS in cooperation with the American College Testing. Our data base consists of over 90,000 students, and is being analyzed in order to identify success and failure factors so that we will be able to provide students with appropriate attention. The district is also working with ACT on a high school orientation project and a microcomputer software testing program which would provide campuses with immediate access to information needed by counselors, administrators, faculty and students.

We have also moved forward on the development of a permanent campus for Los Angeles Mission College. The State Chancellor's Office and Board of Governors, on January 23, approved the Instructional Administration Building. The California Postsecondary Education Commission, on February 3, took under advisement the construction of the Instructional/Administration Building. CPEC staff will bring a recommendation to the Commissioners at their March meeting.

Administrative Reorganization

Immediately following last year's State of the District Address, the administration began the necessary groundwork for an administrative reorganization of the district. The goals and objectives of the plan were presented to the Board in my Status-Update message of May 15th. At that time, I announced the necessity of downsizing district operations to meet expected revenue reductions for 1985-86, and set as an immediate goal a 10% reduction of administrative positions. That plan was implemented in the succeeding months.

There were 255.5 management employees as of Spring, 1985. A reduction of 10%, or 26 positions, would have reduced that number to 229.5 positions. In fact, we exceeded the first year's goal by reducing our administrative staff to 222.5 as of Spring, 1986.

The Administrative Organization Committee of the Cabinet, chaired by President Tom Stevens, has formulated a staffing plan for 1986-87 which will achieve the second 10% reduction in administrative staff. A reduction of 16 additional positions will bring our administrative staff to 206.5 positions, achieving the goals set last year of a 20% reduction over two years.

The committee further proposed that campus administrative staffing be related to size and WSCH, and has adjusted college ad-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ministrative staffs accordingly. Roughly speaking the plan calls for the large campuses to maintain their current levels, with the reductions coming from the smaller campuses. This task has been a difficult one, and I want to commend the committee and its chair, President Stevens, for an excellent job.

As part of the plan, Southwest College will acquire an Hispanic administrator, whose special charge will be to determine ways in which the college can attract the significant number of Hispanic residents of the community who are not attending the college. Similarly, at West Los Angeles College, an administrator has been added to the staff, using funds from the Santa Monica/West Los Angeles Consortium for the purpose of increasing Hispanic representation from the local area.

The District Office will continue the restructuring of its operations to accomplish the objectives set forth last year. Additional District-wide responsibilities will be housed on college campuses rather than in the central office. The Employment Training Panel Programs, and the thirteen persons attached to those programs, will be moved to West Los Angeles College and will become the responsibility of the president of the college.

The programs of the Office of Occupational and Technical Education – VEA, JTPA, GAIN and other specially funded programs, will remain in the District Office, and will be given a new impetus under the leadership of Dr. Walter McIntosh.

As it decentralizes its operational responsibilities, the district will continue the development of its policymaking capabilities. District decision making has a policy component and an operational component. In the June reorganization, the Office of the Chancellor assumed responsibility for policy making in the educational area through the establishment of the Office of Educational Policy.

It is my intention in the coming year to expand my familiarity with the financial operations of the district. I will study the audits and work with the Vice Chancellor of Business Services and the Board. It is my objective to continue to strengthen the district's and colleges' financial operations and capabilities. A second objective project will be to continue the development of the concept of College Service Centers, with a charge back to colleges of the real costs of college operations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Restructuring the Faculty and Staff

I have described the actions taken by the district in the past year to reduce and restructure the administrative staff of the district. These efforts, as I have indicated previously, have resulted in a 10% cut for 1985-86 and will result in a 10% cut in 1986-87, fulfilling the goals set for those years. These changes totaling a 20% reduction in two years were difficult, but they were necessary precursors to the restructuring of the district's educational programs. They were also clear indications of the seriousness of the reduction effort.

On September 4, 1985, in presenting the 1985-86 Final Budget to the Board of Trustees, I pointed out that the budget was a retrenchment document and reflected the desire of the district to be more cost effective through (1) adjusting staff practices, (2) consolidating administrative and support structures, (3) limiting low enrollment course offerings of existing programs, and (4) assigning more faculty to teach courses outside of traditional assignments.

I then directed my remarks to the presidents and union and senate leaders present, inviting them to an open forum to discuss three issues which were absolutely essential for the future of the district. These were:

1. The district, in general, and the colleges, in particular, must maintain flexibility to meet changing program needs and declining levels of financial support, while ideally preserving an appropriate faculty.
2. Our colleges must ensure a high level of faculty intellectual vitality and thereby safeguard and advance the quality of instruction.
3. Our district and our colleges must respond to public and legislative demands for increased productivity, especially in instruction.

The words "flexibility," "vitality," and "productivity" were not used lightly. The central problem for our administration, I stated at the time, is that of "finding support for retrenchment actions from among the faculty – not just opposition or mere acquiesence."

I regret to say that the district was not able to develop a consensus on the depth or seriousness of the need for retrenchment. And, yet, the problem of imbalances in resources, staffing and programs remained to be dealt with.

The district did attempt to use the mechanisms it had available to deal with the overstaffing problem. In the last three years, for example, we have offered retirement incentives which have been accepted by 232 full-time faculty members.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I believe that the Board of Trustees, in making the difficult decision to send layoff notices to 142.5 regular faculty members, has seized the only option remaining to revitalize the educational program, to meet student demand, and to become more competitive. There can be no question that the action is painful to the many faculty members who are involved, to their families, and to their colleagues and students. It is my sincere hope that the actual number of faculty layoffs will be significantly fewer than the 142 who received notices. Some reduction in the number is possible due to our ability to reassign faculty who have second credentials to other high demand subjects. The district has made every attempt to assist the affected faculty members to find positions in high demand disciplines. The district has, for example, brought Mrs. Dorothy Cloud out of retirement to examine the backgrounds of the faculty members who do not have alternate credentials to determine whether they qualify in other areas.

The classified staff of the district is also in the process of being restructured so as to provide needed support services to the campuses. The Board has appropriated $2 million for the filling of approximately 100 positions out of the 300 unfilled positions in the Classified Staffing Plan. The Classified Staffing Committee will be charged with making recommendations to the Board for the restructuring of the classified staff.

Retrenchment requires the existence of retraining and in-service work for those faculty who will be teaching in new disciplines. We will continue to support those with immediate needs, and for the future, to continue retraining programs for both certificated and classified staff in low-demand areas. The district is, of course, in the process of negotiating the effects of layoff with the AFT College Guild.

Board Objectives

The Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District has been clear in its direction. The first priority, indicated by unanimous Board action, is the requirement that the budget remain in balance. A balanced budget resolution, made by Trustees Lindsay Conner, Wallace Albertson and Leticia Quezada and approved by the Board, reflects the Board's commitment to fiscal responsibility. That resolution states that the district "shall not incur a financial deficit for this fiscal year or any succeeding fiscal year, and shall operate within the limits of a balanced budget."

The second objective of the Board, and the highest priority for the college and district administration, is the increase in enrollment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in Fall 1986. My goal is to add 4,000 students to the district in the Fall semester. In the coming weeks, I will request growth objectives from each of our colleges. The Board's expectation, and my expectation is that the district and college administrations will be evaluated on the basis of these goals.

In the past year, the district has worked to stabilize enrollment at West Los Angeles and Southwest Colleges. The Santa Monica/West L.A Consortium promises to not only create a vehicle to return enrollments to our colleges, but to provide money for investment in growth projects at these two colleges. The Consortium has already resulted in an enrollment increase of nearly 1,100 students at West Los Angeles College. My personal objective for 1986-87 is to turn enrollment around at both West and Southwest, and I am confident that we will be successful.

The administration of the district will continue its effort to provide the Board with long and short range planning documents. The activities of the Access and Excellence Committee chaired by Presidents Art Avila and Tom Stevens and staffed and supported by the Educational Services Division have produced a number of important planning documents. Many of their proposals have been implemented; many are awaiting funding, which may now be possible with the $4.6 million expansion fund.

The 1986 Committee, chaired by President Stevens and made up of representatives of the major constituencies of the district and members of the community, spent the Fall semester in planning discussions related to the 1986-87 year. A report was prepared and presented to the Cabinet. That report will be a part of the on-going discussions related to the coming year.

Expansion of Programs

The Board of Trustees has also made clear its intention to put more dollars into the courses and programs where student demand is high, and more investment dollars into the campus environment. We need to improve the physical plant, the attractiveness, and the support services if we hope to be competitive enough to bring students back to the district.

The Board action of February 5, 1986 has appropriated $2 million for the expansion of educational programs, $2 million for the filling of classified positions, and $600,000 for supplies and equipment. The primary purpose of the funds are first, enrollment in high-demand disciplines, and, second, to partially restore the balance between academic programs and support service supplies and equipment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These funds will be used to fund high enrollment classes and needed refurbishments of the physical plant. I believe that these funds can also provide seed money to make major changes in our educational delivery systems.

Students are attracted to college by programs and promises of specific rewards at the successful conclusion of those programs. I am recommending the expanded development of core programs throughout the curriculum. Core programs could be modeled on the lines of PACE (geared to the working adult, scheduled at times convenient to the student) or of the UCLA Alliance Program (for full-time day students). In the core concept, the district would put together a program of reading, writing, math and other skills that would culminate in a specific objective. We would guarantee that a student who took the core program would get the courses in a specified time, and at the end of it would be prepared for either further training or entry level employment. For employers, we would certify that the student had basic literacy skills and certain other enumerated competencies.

The attractiveness of core programs comes from their guarantees to both the student and the institution or employer which receives the student. Examples of core programs would include a Business Readiness Core; a Liberal Arts Core (marketed as a CSU Certification program, a Teacher Preparation or Pre-Law Core); an ESL Core; a Basic Skills core, and many others.

I am proposing the establishment of three programs to advance the concept and assist in the development of core programs on our campuses.

The first is a Core Curriculum Development Laboratory, consisting of a cadre of no more than five persons from the fields of Psychology, History, Foreign Languages and related fields with appropriate administrative and staff support. The purpose would be to develop the programs, work with campus faculties and curriculum committees to institute them, and to monitor their success as academic delivery systems. The Laboratory would also be the catalyst for experiments in course linkages and inter-disciplinary teaching.

An ESL Institute, charged with the task of developing a core curriculum to deal with the ever-increasing educational needs of non-native speakers, would work along side the Development Laboratory on its more specific mission.

Finally, a Counseling Core program unit would be charged with the responsibility of focusing on counselling and matriculation issues related to each core program and to the curriculum in general.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Future

Finally, I would like to make a few comments about the long-term future. The Los Angeles Community College District has been through the most difficult period of its history. Hard times have made us a smaller organization, but I believe that the changes we have made in the past year, and those to come in the foreseeable future, have been the appropriate ones. We have, I believe, made the decisions necessary to match our administration, faculty and staff and to the demands of the 1980s and beyond.

The district is at a turning point in its history, the point at which we no longer have to look down, but can look up.

This district must leave behind the years of declining enrollment, with all its negative consequences, and prepare for new students, new programs, and new colleges.

If one considers that our potential for growth is at least back to our earlier numbers; that is, from 85,000 to 130,000 students, then we have the potential to change our programs, our curriculum and our colleges by 50% through growth alone.

Today the Los Angeles Community College District is poised for the future and committed to growth. With continued Board leadership, proper planning, the unity of common purpose and time, the district has the potential to be anything it chooses to be.

From this point, we can choose our future. I believe that we are on the verge of a new era for our colleges and a new era for the district. I look forward to working with you to achieve the excellence we all desire.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
APR 24 1986

16